

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1-16 have been amended. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the claims as originally filed. Since the amendments to the claims are being made at the behest of the Examiner, this amendment is believed to place the application in condition for allowance, and entry therefore is respectfully requested. In the alternative, entry of this amendment is requested as placing the application in better condition for appeal by, at least, reducing the number of issues outstanding. Further reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments. The Applicants, however, are disappointed that their arguments were not found to be persuasive. The specification has been revised to make the extent to which the invention is described more apparent.

With respect to the second full paragraph at page 15, the disagreement over the density of information appears to stem from interpretation of the word "information." Buttons are not information when they are printed on the page, even though, as the final Office Action points out, if the buttons are not printed on the page, there is less printed matter. Buttons on a page are, rather, simply background.

Thus, printing the buttons does not increase the amount of *information* on the page. Since the buttons add no information when they are printed, but rather simply take up space, printing the buttons will reduce the density of the information, i.e. the information per unit area. This is submitted to be logical.

With respect to the last paragraph on page 16, continuing at the top of page 17, applications for patents are not required to be in the English language. Although the subject application is in English, 37 C.F.R. § 1.52(d) specifically provides for applications to be filed in languages other than English. As provided therein:

A nonprovisional or provisional application may be in a language other than English.

37 C.F.R. § 1.52(b)(1)(ii), rather, allows for applications to be filed in languages other than English, as long as they are accompanied by a translation.

Furthermore, M.P.E.P. § 608.01(V), which includes the reference to "idiomatic" English to which the final Office Action refers, is directed specifically to applications filed in languages other

than English. M.P.E.P. § 608.01(V), in particular, is describing the steps that must be taken after filing an application in another language than the English language. Since, as discussed above, the subject application was filed in the English language, this section is not relevant to the subject application. Still, as provided therein:

The translation must be a literal translation and must be accompanied by a statement that the translation is accurate. The translation must also be accompanied by a signed request from the applicant, his or her attorney or agent, asking that the English translation be used as the copy for examination purposes in the Office. If the English translation does not conform to idiomatic English and United States practice, it should be accompanied by a preliminary amendment making the necessary changes without the introduction of new matter prohibited by 35 U.S.C. 132.

Thus, although conformance to idiomatic English may be required for a translation of an application that was not filed in the English language, that is not the case here. Further reconsideration is thus requested.

Objections to the Specification:

The Specification has been objected to for various informalities. Appropriate corrections were made. A substitute specification is attached. No new matter has been added. The specification is believed to conform to 37 C.F.R. §1.52 (a) and (b) with respect to, inter alia idiomatic English.

In particular, paragraph [0002] now describes:

To download and print an electronic document stored on a network, hardware is required to enable a continuous connection or dialup connection to the Internet. An electronic document that is stored as a main file such as a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) file may include links to other files.

Paragraph [0003], similarly, now describes:

If the files forming the electronic document are temporarily stored in a local area of a computer before printing, a user needs to modify the absolute path of the links in the main file to a path relative to the location of the files in the local area.

An absolute description of a link is the path to the file. A relative description is the path to the file relative to the main file, which is the file in which the links are embedded. When a storage location of a file containing links is moved or copied, the paths represented by the embedded links must be updated to reflect the new location of the main file.

Paragraph [0004], similarly, now describes:

In order to shorten the time required to print an electronic document described in

HTML, Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication No. 11-25156 describes a method in which a system downloads the files forming the Web page, automatically embeds the path to the linked file (the linked page) at the point of the link anchor to the main file (the main page), and prints the new edited file.

Paragraph [0005], similarly, now describes:

It is one object of the present invention to provide a system, a method and a computer program for printing such a downloaded electronic document, for example a online help file or an online manual file, premised on viewing by a Web browser onto sheet material to obtain a real printed material having the proper style of a booklet or a book.

The word "promised" should have been "premised." Sheet material may be paper, as described at paragraph [0064], although it could be other materials as well.

Paragraph [0006] now describes:

Specifically, it is the object of the present invention to provide a system, a method and a computer program for printing a downloaded electronic document as a real printed material having a front cover printed with the title of the document, the table of contents and so on; or a header, a footer, or both of them, containing the title of a chapter printed on individual pages.

With respect to the assertion at the top of page 3 of the final Office Action that the statement that printing navigation buttons will reduce the density of information on the printed page is inaccurate, the navigation buttons are not the information, but are, rather, extraneous to the information. Adding navigation buttons to the rest of the items on the printed page, therefore, ought to *reduce* the overall density of the information on the average, since more of the items on the page will be non-information. The statement is thus believed to be accurate.

With respect to the assertion at the bottom of page 3 of the final Office Action that the applicant must use terms in a consistent manner, using synonyms such as HTML file and main file is submitted to be consistent with application drafting standards. Synonyms of various words are often used in the interest of full disclosure, as well as generality. Withdrawal of the objections is earnestly solicited.

Objections to the Claims:

Claims 1-16 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 1-16 have been amended. Claims 1-16 are believed to meet the requirements of U.S. claim drafting practice. Withdrawal of the objection is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Claims 1-16 have been amended. With respect to pages 9 and 10 of the final Office Action, the second clause of claim 1, in particular, now recites "means for determining analysis defining information based on a description rule and based on a template used for describing the electronic document in the markup language."

The description rule to which claim 1 refers is the description rule which was used to describe the electronic document 4 in HTML, as described in paragraph [0019] of the specification. A description rule is thus an html name of the document.

With respect to page 11 of the final Office Action, the third clause of claim 1 now recites, "means for extracting cover information displayed on a cover of the electronic document based on tag information on a tag and based on a directive described in a document file."

With respect to page 12 of the final Office Action, the fifth clause of claim 1 now recites, "means for analyzing a description of the document file based on the analysis defining information."

Finally, with respect to page 13 of the final Office Action, the last clause of claim 1 now recites, "means for printing a document with the cover based on the cover file and the converted file in accordance with a request for printing the electronic document."

Claims 1-16 are believed to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance. Allowance of all claims 1-16 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/685,493

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: 
Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

Date: 28 AUG 06
1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

Attachments: Substitute Specification
Marked-up Copy of Substitute Specification showing changes made